REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank Examiner David Q. Nguyen and Examiner Temica Beamer for the telephonic interview on February 3, 2005. In summary, the interview focused on the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Graziadei (U.S. Patent No. 4,480,337). With respect to Figure 2 of Graziadei, Examiners Nguyen and Beamer stated that transistors T8 and T9 read on the claimed gain stage, transistors T5, T6, and T7 read on the claimed bias circuit, transistor T12 reads on the claimed current shunt, and the reference voltage (Va) reads on the claimed reference voltage. Applicant's representative argued that no current is shunted through the transistor T12 from the reference voltage (V12) to the common node of the transistors T8 and T9. Rather, as disclosed in column 3, lines 46-57 of Graziadei, the RF input signal is shunted to the common node of the transistors T8 and T9. Thus, Graziadei discloses shunting the RF input signal to the common node of the transistors T8 and T9. Applicant's representative further argued that Graziadei does not teach that a current flows from the reference voltage (V_{r2}) through the transistor T12 to the common node of transistors T8 and T9. Further, as one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand, a transistor does not conduct current from the base to collector. Thus, in view of the inherent characteristics of a transistor. the Patent Office's position that current is shunted from the reference voltage (V12) through the transistor T12 to the common node of the transistors T8 and T9 is not possible.

Examiners Nguyen and Beamer then agreed that Applicant's invention is not disclosed by Graziadei. Applicant's representative proposed that claim 1 be amended to read "a current shunt circuit coupled between the common node and a reference voltage, the current shunt circuit providing a second current from the reference voltage to the common node" to more clearly define the invention. Since Graziadei does not expressly or inherently disclose a current flowing from the reference voltage (V_{r2}) through the transistor T12 to the common node of the transistors T8 and T9, Examiners Nguyen and Beamer agreed that the proposed amendment would overcome the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Graziadei.

Applicant has amended claim 1 as proposed during the telephonic interview. Applicant has also amended claim 3 to further clarify the claimed invention. Applicant has amended the other independent claim, claim 27, to include language similar to that added to claim 1.

→ USPTO Ctrl Fax

In view of the discussion above, claims 1-18 and 27-32 are allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. If any issues remain, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney of record to expedite allowance and issue.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW TERRANOVA

By:

Benjamin S. Withrow Registration No. 40,876

P.O. Box 1287 Cary, NC 27512

Telephone: (919) 654-4520

Date: February 4, 2005 Attorney Docket: 2867-233

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING TRANSMITTED VIA FACSIMILE ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW TO:

Examiner: David Neuven Art Unit: 2681 Fax; 703-872-9306